

Remarks

The following remarks are responsive to the Office Action of October 17, 2007. At the time of the Office Action claims 1-21 were pending. No amendments have been made to the claims in this response. In view of the remarks that follow, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance.

Summary of the Rejections

The Office Action set forth the following rejection: claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Nachman et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0027474).

Claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Office Action rejected independent claims 1, 20 and 21 as anticipated by Nachman. Nachman describes “instant messaging and further functions between the users of computers 101-103 currently viewing the same web page or site on server 104.” (Nachman, paragraph 31). The Office Action analogizes the browser of Nachman to the claimed confidence component, an application of the second family, and analogizes the messaging module java applet that has been downloaded from the web site discussed above (Nachman, paragraphs 33-34) as the claimed application of the first family.

The Applicants respectfully disagree with the Office Action’s characterizations and the premise that independent claims 1, 20 and 21 are anticipated by Nachman. Each of these claims require the limitation of (i) “a first family of applications and a second family of applications having communication capacities on the network extending beyond communication capacities of the applications of the first family,” and (ii) with regard to transmission of a message via the network, “said message being transmitted under conditions inaccessible to the applications of the first family.”

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Office Action’s characterization of Nachman’s Java applet as the claimed application of the first family. Such an application as taught by Nachman has been downloaded from a given web site and whose capacity to send requests is limited by the origin of the application download (Nachman, paragraph 34, and FIG. 2) is recognized as a “confidence” application just as a browser is recognized as a “confidence” application (specification, page 3, lines 15-17, page 5, lines 15-24, and page 6, lines 19-27). Thus, the Java applet of Nachman could not be an application of the first family. Moreover, because both the Java applet and the browser are “confidence” applications, the message transmitted from the confidence component (analogized by the

Office Action as the browser) via the network is not being transmitted under conditions inaccessible to an application of the first family. The browser is not a confidence component between a non-confident application and the server. Because the cited reference fails to teach, suggest or disclose at least these features claimed in claims 1, 20 and 21, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 20 and 21. Applicants additionally request the withdrawal of the rejections of all of the dependent claims for at least the same reasons as noted above.

The application is considered in good and proper form for allowance, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

/brian c. rupp/

Brian C. Rupp, Reg. No. 35,665
Nicole M. Bulman, Reg. No. 59,421
DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP
191 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 3700
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1698
(312) 569-1000 (telephone)
(312) 569-3000 (facsimile)
Customer No.: 08968

Date: January 16, 2008

CH01/ 12527434.1